

NOTES ON PERUVIAN ORCHIDS

BY

CHARLES SCHWEINFURTH

THE examination of loans obtained chiefly from the Presl Herbarium at Prague by Mr. Leslie A. Garay of the University of Toronto has revealed the necessity of making several changes in nomenclature.

HABENARIA LINIFOLIA Presl Reliquiae Haenkeanae 1 (1827) 91.

The type collection of *Habenaria linifolia*, borrowed from Prague, is incomplete, showing only the upper portion of the plant including two leaves and a loosely flowered spike, but it definitely agrees with the description. The plant, however, resembles certain forms of *Habenaria dilatata* (Pursh) Hooker. On examining a flower, moreover, which likewise matches the description, it was found that the lip exactly coincides with that of some forms of the latter species.

Since *Habenaria dilatata* is a boreal species extending only as far south as New Mexico and California and has never been recorded from Central or South America, its occurrence in Peru seems well nigh incredible. Moreover, it is a known fact that some of the species described by Presl in the above work have been confused owing to mixed labels. It seems desirable, therefore, that *Habenaria linifolia* be reduced to synonymy and omitted from the list of Peruvian species.

Pleurothallis diffusa Poepp. & Endl. var. **grandiflora** (C. Schweinf.) C. Schweinfurth comb. nov.

Pleurothallis semipellucida Reichb.f. var. *grandiflora* C. Schweinf. in Bot. Mus. Leaflet. Harvard Univ. 15 (1951) 102.

Mr. Garay has pointed out that the concept *Pleurothallis semipellucida* is synonymous with the earlier *P. diffusa*. Consequently, the above transfer becomes necessary.

Pleurothallis secunda Poepp. & Endl. var. **longiracema** (C. Schweinf.) C. Schweinfurth comb. nov.

Pleurothallis Lindenii Lindl. var. *longiracema* C. Schweinf. in Bot. Mus. Leaflet. Harvard Univ. 16 (1953) 53.

Since Mr. Garay has likewise indicated that the species described as *Pleurothallis Lindenii* is referable to the earlier *P. secunda*, it is necessary to publish the above change.

Epidendrum dichotomum Presl Reliquiae Haenkeanae 1 (1827) 101, non Lindl. Fol. Orch. Epidendrum (1853) 71, no. 223.

Epidendrum brachyphyllum Lindl. Fol. Orch. Epidendrum (1853) 72, no. 225.

Epidendrum Lindenii Lindl. Bot. Reg. 31 (1845) Misc. 48, no. 59; Fol. Orch. Epidendrum (1853) 72, no. 227, non *Epidendrum Lindenii* Lindl. in Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. 12 (1843) 397.

Epidendrum cuzcoense Schltr. in Fedde Repert. Beih. 9 (1921) 82; Mansf. in Fedde Repert. Beih. 57 (1929) t. 117, nr. 460.

Epidendrum tarmense Schltr. in Fedde Repert. Beih. 9 (1921) 94; Mansf. in Fedde Repert. Beih. 57 (1929) t. 122, nr. 477.

Epidendrum inconstans Ames in Bull. Torr. Bot. Club 58 (1931) 350.

Examination of the type of *Epidendrum dichotomum*, obtained from Prague, shows that it represents the highly variable and widely dispersed species that has been variously designated as *E. brachyphyllum*, *E. Lindenii*, *E. cuzcoense*, *E. tarmense* and *E. inconstans*.

The plants and inflorescences of this collection, while they show considerable variation in size, correspond reasonably well with the description. Moreover, this record was considered by Reichenbach himself as truly to represent the type. The flowers appear to be more or less larger than those described, but they are well within the range of the *E. brachyphyllum* complex. The large, lobed callus on the lamina of the lip appears in this collection to be somewhat farther extended on the disc than usual in *E. brachyphyllum*, yet it is closely similar to that of some forms attributed to that species.

It seems justifiable to consider *E. dichotomum* as the earliest name to represent this polymorphic concept.

***Epidendrum Funkii* Reichb.f.** in Linnaea 22 (1849) 839.

Epidendrum brachycladium Lindl. Fol. Orch. Epidendrum (1853) 60, no. 186.

Epidendrum brachycladium (B) *crassipes* Lindl., l.c.

Epidendrum crassipes Kränzl., in Engler Bot. Jahrb. 54, Beibl. 117 (1916) 25.

A study of the type of *Epidendrum Funkii* makes it evident that this species includes the concepts described as *E. brachycladium* and *E. brachycladium* var. *crassipes* (later set apart as *E. crassipes*).

Both vegetatively and florally it is a counterpart of the plant designated as *E. brachycladium* (B) *crassipes*, as shown by a photograph of Lindley's type with floral

analysis, in the Ames Herbarium, having the base of the stem fusiform-thickened and the petals and the lobes of the lip conspicuously denticulate or lacerate-dentate.

The typical form of *E. brachycladium*, described without the base of the stem, was said to have the petals and the lobes of the lip “but little toothed, or even entire.”

A wide range of specimens in the Ames Herbarium referable to this polymorphic species shows a marked difference in the degree of bulbous dilation in the basal part of the stem and a great variation in the extent of toothing of the petals and the lobes of the lip. It appears preferable, therefore, to agree with Lindley (l.c.) and regard these plants as inseparable.

It seems worthy of note that a flower from the type of *E. Funkii* shows a petal which is irregularly denticulate (not three-lobed as described) and lateral lobes of the lip which are evenly lacerate-dentate (not retuse as stated).

Epidendrum Haenkeanum *Presl* Reliquiae Haenkeanae 1 (1827) 100; Lindl. Fol. Orch. Epidendrum (1853) 58, no. 179.

Epidendrum juninense Schltr. in Fedde Repert. Beih. 9 (1921) 87; Mansf. in Fedde Repert. Beih. 57 (1929) t. 119, nr. 466.

The type of *E. Haenkeanum*, likewise borrowed from Prague, appears to be inseparable from *E. juninense*. While it consists of a simple stem, the lower portion shows an incipient branch, as is characteristic of the latter species. The general appearance, as well as the leaves, panicle and flowers, are quite indistinguishable from those of *E. juninense*.

Epidendrum laxum *Poeppig & Endlicher* Nov. Gen. ac Sp. 2 (1837–38) 2; Lindl. Fol. Orch. Epidendrum (1853) 57, no. 176.

Epidendrum macrothyrsis Lehm. & Kränzl. in Engler Bot. Jahrb. 26 (1899) 472.

An examination of the type specimens of *Epidendrum laxum*, which were borrowed from Vienna, makes it certain that this species includes *E. macrothyrsis*, as Schlechter claimed (in Fedde Repert. Beih. 27 (1924) 67. It does not appear that the leaves of *E. laxum*, at least in the dried material, are either fleshy or shining, characters formerly used, in part, to separate these concepts.

This species appears to vary considerably as to the size and proportions of the leaves and especially of the floral segments. One collection seems to be particularly aberrant in having small flowers with short lateral lobes of the lip and a relatively large, narrowly triangular mid-lobe. However, in view of the apparent variability of the species, it seems scarcely worthy of even varietal recognition.

Polystachya foliosa (Lindl.) Reichb.f. in Walp. Ann. 6 (1863) 640.

Stelis foliosa Lindley in Ann. Nat. Hist. 2 (1839) 330, t. 17.

Polystachya nana (Poepp. & Endl.) Reichb.f. in Walp. Ann. 6 (1863) 638.

The extremely widespread and variable species of *Polystachya*, which was referred to *P. nana* (Poepp. & Endl.) Reichb.f. (in Bot. Mus. Leaflet Harvard Univ. 17 (1955) 51), should bear the name *P. foliosa* (Lindl.) Reichb.f.

The epithet *nana*, mistakenly regarded by me as a nomen, is untenable, as it was validly used by Klotzsch in 1853 (in Ind. Sem. Hort. Berol. (1853) nr. 5), ten years before Reichenbach employed the name.

Apparently *Stelis foliosa* (1839) is the earliest name-bringing synonym.